

Durham Research Online

Deposited in DRO:

06 March 2015

Version of attached file:

Accepted Version

Peer-review status of attached file:

Peer-reviewed

Citation for published item:

Scales, L. (2010) 'The illuminated Reich : memory, crisis and the visibility of monarchy in late medieval Germany.', in *The Holy Roman Empire, reconsidered*. New York ; Oxford: Berghahn, pp. 73-92.

Further information on publisher's website:

<http://www.berghahnbooks.com/title.php?rowtag=CoyHoly>

Publisher's copyright statement:

This chapter appears in a larger collection published by Berghahn Books (<http://www.berghahnbooks.com/title.php?rowtag=CoyHoly>). Scales, Len 2010. 'The illuminated Reich : memory, crisis and the visibility of monarchy in late medieval Germany.' In *The Holy Roman Empire, Reconsidered*, eds. Jason Philip Coy, Benjamin Marschke, and David Warren Sabean. New York: Berghahn Books.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in DRO
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full DRO policy](#) for further details.

**The Illuminated *Reich*: Memory, Crisis, and the Visibility of Monarchy in Late Medieval
Germany**

by

Len Scales

Writing towards the close of the thirteenth century, the German polemicist Alexander von Roes returned a dismal judgement on his times. In the half century between Frederick II's imperial coronation and the Council of Lyon in 1274, the 'Roman Empire' had so much declined as to pass almost out of remembrance. In fact it had reached a point from which 'it cannot decrease any further without being completely destroyed'.¹ The image of a *Reich* stunted and diminished after its ostensible heyday in a high-medieval *Kaiserzeit* remains an all-too-familiar one, nourished in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries by the nationalist longings and anxieties of a German historiography morbidly preoccupied with false turnings. Yet it is a difficult image to banish altogether, and perhaps we should not try. A chronicler observed of one of the kings of Alexander's calamitous half-century, Richard of Cornwall (1257-72), that he 'came nowhere in the German lands except to the Rhine, and was in fact impotent in the *Reich*'.² Richard's reign may have marked a particular low point, yet the chronicler's words point towards a theme which might be inscribed above the entire late medieval history of the imperial monarchy: the problem of *presence*.

Presence, in the broadest sense, was what the most effective late medieval monarchies commanded within their realms and the Empire's rulers appear conspicuously to have lacked. It had various facets. In part, it was a function of the growth of government. Across much of Latin Europe the late Middle Ages were a time of expanding royal administration and revenues, and a

multiplication of the points of contact between rulers and ruled.³ Not so in Germany, where the growth of imperial institutions was never better than fitful and sluggish, while revenues from the *Reich* plummeted between the thirteenth and the fifteenth centuries.⁴ Largely lacking the means to give their will effect in their absence, late medieval kings and emperors continued to rely heavily upon itinerant rule, even as the means of supporting the *iter* declined and its scope contracted.⁵ The regions of Germany which Peter Moraw has termed *königsfern* – ‘remote’ from the monarch and his government – grew steadily.⁶

The ruler’s presence among his people was also, however, a reflection of the style and vision of monarchy which he was able to set before them. In part, this too was a factor of resources. When Rupert of the Palatinate (1400-10) came back impoverished into Germany from his disastrous Italian expedition (1402), he was hardly in a position to impress. Contemporary versifiers were duly scathing:

Oh, oh, the travelling trickster’s here.

He’s brought along an empty purse,

That much is all too clear.⁷

But ideological no less than material resources mattered here. German kings, raised to the throne by the election of the princes, had little of the powerful dynastic charisma which their western neighbours, the kings of France, were by this time able to command. No-one celebrated the special holiness of the blood which flowed in the veins of an Adolf of Nassau or a Wenceslas of Luxemburg. The unfortunate Rupert would not be curing anyone’s scrofula. Also wanting, it would seem, was much of the infrastructure of monarchy such as we encounter elsewhere. Even in death, kings and emperors in the late Middle Ages were increasingly remote. While some

continued down to the start of the fourteenth century to be interred beside their Salian and Staufer forebears in the great imperial mausoleum in Speyer, thereafter their remains were scattered among a plethora of mainly dynastic sites, from Pisa to Prague, Bavaria to Hungary.⁸ Not only, then, did Germany lack a Paris; it lacked – and with time, increasingly so – a Saint-Denis, a site of concentrated imperial memory, where the sacred continuity of monarchy might find appropriately monumental expression.⁹

This paper does not seek directly to challenge this well-established view of an imperial monarchy weakened both materially and in public perception during the two centuries which lie between the fall of the Staufer and the consolidation of the Habsburgs on the throne. It will, however, suggest that the presence in Germany of the late medieval *Reich* and its rulers – their public visibility and hold upon the minds of contemporaries – had a more multi-faceted and paradoxical character than may at first appear. As we will see, the very problems besetting the *Reich* had a part in placing it before people's eyes. But the imperial monarchy also had some potently visible resources of its own, to which modern scholarship has not always paid sufficient regard. To approach these, we might begin with the words of a Milanese envoy, writing home in 1461 from the Empire's western edge:

Having viewed a large number of edifices in this region, ... I send ... to Your Excellency the sketch of a town gate in these parts, derived from a design of Julius Caesar, who has left in these territories numerous glorious memorials to himself. I have [also] taken the trouble of having another gate reproduced, which he himself constructed in a town in lower Germany which is called Julius Caesar.¹⁰

The town named from Caesar is probably Jülich, near Aachen. The association is traceable back to Widukind, writing in the tenth century and, in repeating it, the writer was reflecting a perception well established among later medieval Germans also: that the towns and cities of western and southern Germany were of ancient, illustrious, and imperial ancestry.¹¹ Chroniclers counted off, with variable etymological accuracy, the cities boasting an origin in acts of imperial power: Augsburg from Augustus, Cologne (Colonia Agrippinensis) supposedly from Agrippa, and so on. Mighty rulers had once laid hold upon the landscape in ways which, literate observers insisted, remained significant many centuries later. Some of the marks of their greatness had, inevitably, passed from sight: the bridge which Caesar threw across the Rhine at Mainz had long since yielded to the elements, in punishment, it was said, for the people's sins.¹² Not all, however. Most striking in the words of the Milanese envoy (a sceptical, culturally-literate Italian) is the conviction that verbal tradition was authenticated by the physical vestiges of a remote imperial past which still marked the landscape in the second half of the fifteenth century.¹³

The legendary peregrinations of the Roman Empire's reputed founder had taken root in the soil itself, in local memories and memorials. The Strasbourg chronicler Jakob Twinger, writing around the end of the fourteenth century, told how, after subduing all the German lands, Caesar had come to the temple at nearby Ebersheimmünster, given thanks for his victory and renewed the image there. 'And from that self-same temple was afterwards built the magnificent monastery of Ebersheimmünster.'¹⁴ Elsewhere, the symbolism of temporal dominance asserted a more direct continuity. An inscription to be seen in the fifteenth century on the castle at Nijmegen (well off the paths travelled by most late medieval emperors) claimed Caesar as its first builder.¹⁵ Nor was it only in Jülich that names and objects combined to inscribe his originating presence. One tradition had him making his way through the *königsfern* north, and happening by moonlight upon the site of Lüneburg. In remembrance of the fact, he had set up a golden moon (*luna*) on a

pillar, which was worshipped by the people round about.¹⁶ The story is preserved in the *Saxon World Chronicle*, from the thirteenth century. It found visual embodiment in the roughly contemporary world map from nearby Ebstorf, where Caesar's golden moon still stands above the town.¹⁷

The Empire's first rulers, it was clear, had dominated the German lands as their late medieval successors could not. And where they had not been in hard fact, imagination bore them nonetheless, fixing their presence in legends, inscriptions, artefacts and ancient sites. The medieval western Empire was in fact a comparatively young historical formation, with its roots in the fragmentation of the Carolingian patrimony in the ninth and tenth centuries; but in the understanding of its German partisans it was uniquely ancient, heir to the Romans as well as the Franks – and to the putative forebears of both, the Trojans.¹⁸ And beneath the deposits of these illustrious lost realms lay, in some traditions, the strata of yet more remote pasts upon which they had been built. The very complexity of the Empire's long imagined history, and the diverse regional perspectives which it enfolded, had made of the German lands by the late Middle Ages a dense palimpsest of imagined sites and landscapes of political memory. Reading such ramified and numinous visual texts was an uncertain and subjective matter: monuments nourished myths. Late Roman Trier remained, through its surviving works, massively present to the observer; yet the Trier which fired the imagination of Jakob Twinger was a more ancient one, 'the first and oldest town in the German lands', pre-Roman imperial capital of the Assyrian Trebata – and only much later to be taken, by stealth rather than arms, by Caesar.¹⁹

To expect to find the landscape densely marked by past monarchies was only natural. To Germans of even modest education or experience, it would have been evident that the forebears to whom their late medieval kings looked back were numerous as well as illustrious. The imperial idea underscored remarkable continuities. The fourteenth-century Dominican Heinrich von

Herford could register without a blink that Count Adolf of Nassau (1292-98) was the Empire's hundredth ruler since Caesar.²⁰ Such protracted lineages might take on visible form: carved or cast, or painted on walls or in windows, the ruler-cycle was a characteristically (though not exclusively) German genre. An array of some thirty carved kings and emperors was to be seen, for example, on the façade of Aachen's *Rathaus*, following its renovation in the 1370s.²¹ The perpetuation of the local memory of past rulers was also, however, a consequence of the Empire's historic *discontinuities*, which had left sites and monuments scattered far and wide in its German territories, reflecting the different regional power-bases of successive ruling dynasties. The Conciliarist Dietrich von Niem knew of Charlemagne's reputed birth at Ingelheim 'on the River Rhine' close to Mainz, where still stood in the fifteenth century, recently renovated, 'the palace in which he was born'.²² Nor was it everywhere different in the *königsfern* north. Henry III's great palace at Goslar had by the mid-thirteenth century largely passed out of the monarchy's orbit; but that did not end its importance as a symbol of the *Reich* for the town's burghers, who jealously guarded their right to receive justice there.²³ The *iter* of the king-emperors might shift its geographical focus and contract altogether with the passing centuries; but the artefacts left strewn across the German lands at its receding often proved to have a more tenacious presence and remembrance.

Not everywhere, of course. The great Salian and Staufer residences had mostly passed out of use, and some out of existence, by the later Middle Ages. The palace at Paderborn, for example, was not rebuilt following its destruction by fire in the twelfth century.²⁴ Occasionally, iconoclasm was intentional. Images of Ludwig the Bavarian (1314-47), to his opponents a heresiarch and persecutor of the Church, were defaced and erased.²⁵ More was doubtless lost in this way than we can know. Yet, while oblivion is a part of the picture, the durability of these resonant locations and objects looms larger. The burghers of fourteenth-century Aachen, who

incorporated the crumbling Carolingian palace into their town hall, were not blind to the traditions upon which they built – as the monumental figure of Charlemagne which guarded their new portal attested.²⁶ Even destruction might mean the dissemination, not obliteration, of memory. Demolition work at Magdeburg seems to have resulted in the dispersal of some of the antique marble columns which, with their imperial resonances, Otto the Great (936-73) had reportedly brought to his metropolis, among a number of religious foundations in north-central Germany.²⁷ The later Middle Ages, moreover, saw the renovation of some earlier memorials, and the establishment of new sites in honour of long-dead rulers.²⁸ Even troublesome pasts might be reinterpreted rather than buried. When Rudolf I came into Thuringia in 1289, he ordered the removal of the pillar marking the defeat of imperial forces by the Saxons at Welfesholz (1115), which was reputedly attracting superstitious veneration – only to replace it with a memorial chapel on the same site.²⁹

Historically, the Empire's several pasts had done more than merely overshadow the land: they radiated an active legitimacy which did not depend upon the presence of a reigning monarch. One source of this lay in the cults of imperial and crypto-imperial saints. Late medieval kings may seldom have come to Bamberg; but Henry II (1002-24) and Kunigunde, canonised in the twelfth century, were permanently in residence, their skulls preserved in the cathedral treasury, while their representations in stone multiplied around them.³⁰ Nor were the Three Kings of Cologne going anywhere – though late medieval tradition dictated that the newly-crowned *rex Romanorum* should solemnly come to *them*, thus reaffirming the Magi too as historic pillars of the *Reich*.³¹ Charlemagne, a saint by imperial decree (1165), was by tradition much more besides – wise judge, lawgiver, holy warrior, the Empire's very translator to the Germans – and as such to be met with in effigy in diverse media and locations, from tapestry to town gate.³² The historicising urge was well established in the Empire's visual culture from an early date.

Charlemagne's Aachen was simultaneously late antique Ravenna; high medieval Speyer borrowed from Roman Trier; and Aachen and Speyer were in their turn reproduced and cited in the imperial architecture which came after.³³ The unparalleled urge among German builders and patrons to cling onto and invoke the vestiges of times past must be understood in light of the special prestige to which that past seemed to hold a key.³⁴ Never had visible prestige seemed as needful as in the centuries which began with the fall of the Staufer. Even Heinrich Raspe, Thuringian landgrave and fleeting papal anti-king (1246-7), boasted a golden bull with an inscription trumpeting in traditional manner the boundless dominion of *Roma caput mundi*.³⁵ Charles the Great's palace chapel was reproduced afresh, now in the mature gothic style, under his namesake Charles IV (1346-78).³⁶ In Caroline Prague, imperial *mimesis* found expression in a whole new cityscape, making reference at once to Rome, Constantinople, and the heavenly Jerusalem.³⁷ Charles himself proved to be a living, breathing palimpsest of monarchy, repeatedly reproducible in words and rituals, stone, paint and goldsmith's work, as Charlemagne, Constantine, and Vespasian – to say nothing of St Wenceslas, Balthazar, David and Melchizedek.³⁸

But, while the Empire's wealth of legitimising memory certainly favoured its visual invocation, it was cultural, social and economic changes afoot in Germany that speeded and elaborated the process, setting imperial imagery before the eyes of a much extended public. The *Reich* and its rulers attained in the late Middle Ages a significantly heightened visibility for reasons which often had little to do with their own actions or potentialities. Chief among these new currents was the elaboration in Germany of a dense gothic visual culture, which gave a novel priority to image-making and made available its own complex and ramified repertoire of imperial signs and symbols. Monumental statues of crowned and mounted monarchs, in Bamberg (c. 1235-7) and

Magdeburg (c. 1240-5) were the dramatic harbingers of a style which entered Germany late, but then spread swiftly in the troubled decades after 1250.³⁹ From galleries of kings (of the Old or the New Law) in the windows of great churches, to pictured genealogies, individual images of past and living rulers, carved friezes of the seven electors or public fountains adorned with the chivalric ‘Nine Worthies’ (two of them emperors), the gothic impulse to externalise, elaborate, attest and make manifest, embraced the imperial monarchy too, heedless of its evident disabilities.⁴⁰ Or rather, in some ways it did heed them, so that the Empire’s perceived weakness became a further spur to image-making.

With the gothic came a new stress upon seeing – and believing. Images were ascribed an active power to work, through the eye, upon the beholder.⁴¹ By looking, people were to know and accept. Apertures and crystal phials were now cut and inserted into reliquaries to render their contents incontestably real. Christ’s body itself was held up to general view at the mass and borne in procession before the faithful in monstrances.⁴² In the realm of government, in much of Latin Europe the task of inducing acceptance of that which could not be experienced directly fell increasingly to written documents.⁴³ It was above all through their mandates, writs and decrees that rulers were present among their people in their absence. In Germany, however, the late medieval monarchy manifested itself only intermittently and geographically very unevenly through words on parchment.⁴⁴ In these circumstances, images and artefacts offered their own kind of symbolic proximity. They fulfilled in-some-ways-comparable demands, for authentication amid complexity and contestation, and for tangible and talismanic endurance in the face of change and disintegration.

Explaining the availability in this period of new, more readily reproducible, images of the *Reich* in more widely accessible locations also means, however, looking beyond the imperial monarchy and its German territories. It was as part of a pan-European process, the elaboration of

a ubiquitous elite visual language of heraldry, that the black eagle on gold became firmly established, from around the start of the thirteenth century, as an instantly-recognisable code for the *Reich* and its ruler.⁴⁵ A complex, even, for a long time, in its details confusing symbol, the eagle was depicted in both double- and (much more often) single-headed forms. Only in the fifteenth century did a firmer distinction emerge, between the by-then haloed *Doppeladler*, for the emperor, and its simpler cousin, for a mere Aachen-crowned *rex Romanorum*.⁴⁶ The unchecked multiplication of forms in the preceding decades points, however, to an urgent impulse to render the imperial monarchy visible in ways which allowed varied facets of its existence and authority to be given expression. Some imperial towns placed the eagle in their seals, the first as early as c.1180.⁴⁷ The new dynasties on the throne took it up, not only for the reigning monarch himself, but in variant forms for his sons and wider kin. Coupled with dynastic devices, like the double-tailed Bohemian lion, eagles proliferated about their glittering residential cities. Illustrious emperors from the pre-heraldic past were posthumously granted double-eagle shields, while their late medieval descendants introduced the Empire's heraldry in an increasingly deliberate and ramified way into the paraphernalia of their rule.⁴⁸

Economic change in late medieval Germany further speeded the proliferation of signs and symbols of the *Reich*. The rise of urban markets and urban crafts made for an environment in which images were readily commissioned and produced – and widely viewed. A document from Strasbourg records how, on a visit to the city, Charles IV had borrowed a tent decorated with heraldic roses, which 'Konrad the painter' was charged to repaint with the emperor's arms.⁴⁹ With the urbanisation of much of the Empire's visual culture therefore went, over time, what might almost be termed its commodification. By the fifteenth century, the imperial armorial was being applied to a wide range of portable, personal and manufactured objects: clothing, banners, hats, brooches, horse-trappers, saddles, belt-fasteners and caskets, to name but some.⁵⁰ The coins

for purchasing such objects might likewise bear the imperial eagle, or (such was the great variety of Germany's late medieval coinages) some other, more indirect, imperial reference, such as the devices of the electors.⁵¹ New media and manufacturing processes in the fifteenth century facilitated further the dissemination of visual invocations of the *Reich* and its rulers – on ceramic tiles, on tableware, in woodcuts, or even via that ubiquitous, portable and intrinsically political medium, the playing card.⁵²

How much attention contemporaries may have paid to their political iconography, such objects cannot themselves disclose. Here, however, some general guidance can be drawn from a variety of written texts, which indicate that at least among literate (though not necessarily highly educated) Germans, the symbolism of the *Reich* was from early on the object of keen-eyed, sometimes sharply ironic, comment. A vernacular political singer of the late thirteenth century, the 'Schoolmaster of Eßlingen', glossed the imperial escutcheon – 'an eagle rampant on gold' – as a visible reproach to the contemporary monarch, the Habsburg Rudolf I (1273-91).⁵³ The eagle's 'grim' black hue did not, he thought, suit its under-mighty bearer. A 'woodpecker on a rotten tree' instead, the king inspired as much fear as an outstretched scarecrow in a barley field – an allusion, perhaps, to Rudolf's notoriously gaunt and lanky frame.⁵⁴ The towns increasingly functioned as venues for a political public capable of forming, and acting upon, a view of such matters. When Charles IV came to Passau in 1348, the house in which he stayed was adorned with *signa imperialia aquilarum* – which, however, were quickly smeared with filth by partisans of his Wittelsbach rivals, unwilling to recognise Charles as their rightful bearer.⁵⁵

In Germany, the downfall of the Staufer and the troubled times which followed *and* the reception of the gothic style had all coincided with an era of spectacular urban growth.⁵⁶ The towns now provided an audience for the spectacle of late medieval monarchy such as kings and emperors of the high-medieval *Kaiserzeit* had largely lacked. One chronicler believed that when

the Habsburg Frederick the Fair handed over the imperial regalia to Ludwig the Bavarian at Nuremberg in 1324, ‘many thousands of people’ assembled to view them.⁵⁷ The ruler’s *adventus*, his public entrance into a town, became in the late Middle Ages a central element in imperial ceremonial and, particularly when a monarch came for the first time, was accompanied by spectacular symbolic display.⁵⁸ When Sigismund entered Bern in 1414, he was greeted in the suburbs by five hundred liveried boys, bearing flags and banners of the *Reich* and town and wearing garlands adorned with imperial armorials made from paper.⁵⁹ Such scenes were designed to live on in the minds of those townspeople who lined the streets; and they were often recollected in some detail by town chroniclers.⁶⁰ That such interest was not always merely parochial is indicated by a report in the German vernacular of Charles IV’s funeral in Prague (December 1378), which was incorporated into a chronicle in far-off Augsburg. The eye-witness account, which may have circulated as a newsletter, is remarkable for its identification of the numerous artefacts, banners, and armorials which were shown during the protracted solemnities.⁶¹ It points to the fluency with which at least some in the towns were able to read the symbolism of the *Reich*. Some Germans, indeed, were quite capable not only of interpreting but also judging the constitutional spectacles enacted in their rulers’ names. Heinrich von Herford observed of Charles IV that not only was he elected and crowned in constitutionally incorrect locations but that his Bonn coronation was conducted ‘as if in secret, without due pomp’.⁶² The crises afflicting the late medieval monarchy made appropriate forms of public visibility more, not less, necessary.

The constitutional and political peculiarities of the late medieval *Reich* – its elective crown and polycentric character – lent their own encouragement to the proliferation of sites and symbols in its German territories. The monarchy’s contracting public scope and power, for which these

elements are often blamed, itself stimulated various forms of image-making. Much has traditionally been made of the lack of an imperial capital. Yet, whatever may have been its wider contributions to the course of German history, it should not be assumed that this necessarily rendered the Empire's rulers less visible than their counterparts in neighbouring realms. Indeed, it is possible to argue an opposite case. In the famously centralised late medieval kingdom of England, for example, the visual culture of monarchy was disproportionately focused on (often quasi-private) locations around Westminster, where the kings spent much of their time.⁶³ This same centralisation goes far to explain the heavy concentration of English royal imagery upon reflecting back to the monarchs themselves a glorious but introverted vision of divinely-favoured, dynastic kingship.⁶⁴ The constitutional acts of the Empire's rulers in Germany, by contrast, were shared among a number of historically-significant sites, mostly major towns, each enjoying some of a capital's representative qualities. Merely attaining the throne entailed a succession of public progresses and state occasions: election, normally in Frankfurt, followed by coronation, rightfully in Aachen, and then on, via the Magi's shrine at Cologne, to Nuremberg for the king's first great court.⁶⁵ Attaining these several destinations involved, whenever circumstances allowed, a stately and magnificent progress through some of the most populous, urbanised and culturally advanced landscapes of German-speaking Europe. The solemn assemblies which the monarch held with the princes and other members of the *Reich*, and which by the fifteenth century were also convening in his absence, were likewise shared among a plurality of locations.⁶⁶ In the late Middle Ages these meetings were invariably held north of the Alps – most commonly, but by no means invariably, in those southern and western German regions where imperial properties survived longest and which stood, in Moraw's typology, 'close' to the king. They attracted considerable contemporary notice.⁶⁷

If the era of dynastic *Hausmacht* in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries meant the periodic withdrawal of the ruler from some of these established landscapes of monarchy, it also nurtured new sites of imperial iconography and display: Prague, Munich, Vienna, Wiener Neustadt, Heidelberg, to say nothing of other, lesser and related sites.⁶⁸ In some of these centres, pre-eminently Prague, the symbolism of the *Reich*, now interwoven with that of the ruling house, gained visual articulation of quite unprecedented scope and magnificence. Once again, such locations, and their visible traces in the landscape, tended naturally to multiply over time. As one symptom of this harnessing of the Empire to the cause of dynastic glory, the imperial regalia, which for much of the high Middle Ages had been locked away in strongholds in the German countryside, were given a new visibility in the *Hausmacht* capitals. Ludwig the Bavarian was the first to furnish them with an urban home, in Munich. Under the Luxemburger, their public display became an annual event, first in Prague, later in the imperial town of Nuremberg, where they were thereafter destined to remain.⁶⁹ Fortified by papal indulgences, boasting their own feast day, they drew in the late Middle Ages substantial crowds.

Beneath the impulse of the new ruling dynasties – Habsburg, Luxemburg, Wittelsbach – visibly to draw down upon themselves the Empire's prestige lay another, more pressing one, bound up with the elective character of the crown: to establish their right to wear that crown at all. Between the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries, split elections, anti-kingships and the deposition of reigning monarchs repeatedly placed in doubt the identity of the Empire's rightful head.⁷⁰ It is no coincidence that the regalia, with their sacred relics, were first put on show by Frederick of Habsburg, in 1315 in Basel, as part of his efforts to lend legitimacy to his highly contested kingship.⁷¹ The habit among these dynasties of multiplying symbols of rulership, particularly crowns of varied design, attests the same impulse to make visible their titles to rule.⁷² The profusion, and confusion, of physical manifestations of monarchy in post-Staufer Germany

found startling expression in the periodic counterfeiting of the ruler's own person. The late thirteenth century saw the appearance of a succession of obscure figures claiming to be the by-then thoroughly mythologised emperor Frederick II (d. 1250).⁷³ One such self-made monarch was able to 'rule' in considerable style for several months in the mid-1280s, holding court at Neuß by the Rhine and at Wetzlar, and even issuing documents authenticated with a seal apparently based on Frederick's own.⁷⁴

It is against this backdrop of contending personifications of the *Reich*, and the consequent difficulty of taking even the monarch himself at face value, that we should probably understand the growing emphasis which came during this period to be placed upon the ruler's own physiognomy as an authenticating code. The portrayal of living kings and emperors became more common, attaining an increased variety in forms and locations.⁷⁵ Of Charles IV, who was in this respect exceptional, over seventy different depictions are known.⁷⁶ While many of these were to be found in and around Prague, others were set up in more remote locations – occasionally, in an apparently deliberate attempt by the emperor to propagate his presence in effigy in his lands.⁷⁷ They also, however, propagated increasingly stable and characteristic representations of his appearance. Charles' big eyes and high forehead and cheekbones became familiar, readily reproducible motifs, whether on his great seal or in crypto-portraits within devotional images. His son Sigismund was to have a similarly recognisable profile, marked by a long, often two-pronged beard and topped with a hooped crown or fur hat.⁷⁸ A visual language, at once personalised and highly stereotypical evolved, distinct to each ruler. That there existed in some quarters a lively interest in the monarch's physiognomy is attested by repeated reference in written sources. The supposed wrinkles-and-all veracity of Rudolf I's tomb effigy in Speyer Cathedral had been the subject of a celebrated anecdote recorded by a near-contemporary chronicler in distant Styria.⁷⁹ It was probably the aim of those close to the Luxemburg emperors (and thereafter their Habsburg

successors) to satisfy or stimulate such interest by propagating their caricatured likeness, and thereby to identify them more firmly with the imperial title. No less remarkable, however, are the widespread and varied ways in which the communicative resources at their disposal enabled them to achieve this.

The territories of late medieval Germany, particularly the towns, were home to a riotous proliferation of diverse signs and symbols of power, within which that minority which invoked the Empire had to compete for attention. Yet representations of the *Reich* were also in some respects in contention with one another. Images which portrayed or made allusion to the seven electors struck a note quite different from, and potentially in conflict with, those linking the Empire with its ruling dynasties. Even among the electors themselves there was competition, which might be given enduring and visible form. It was in this way that the cathedral church at Mainz came in the late Middle Ages to be thronged with monumental representations not only of the archbishop-electors themselves but of the kings whom they claimed, with varying accuracy, to have crowned.⁸⁰ One purpose of these effigies was clearly to keep alive Mainz's fading claim to a right of coronation. (Significantly, Cologne, which had the stronger title, took no comparable steps to commemorate it visually.) Late medieval contests for the throne, which divided the electors against one another, meanwhile added further sites of king-making: Bonn, Cologne, and Rhens, with its open-air throne beside the Rhine by Koblenz.⁸¹

For some late medieval commentators the electors were the true repository of the Roman Empire's historic translation to the German people. The exclusive college of seven princes which emerged over the course of the thirteenth century quickly attained a central place in the political theology and constitutional life of the *Reich*, resoundingly reaffirmed and defined in detail in the Golden Bull of 1356.⁸² Already during the thirteenth century, this new centrality was receiving visible expression in public artefacts.⁸³ In the decades that followed, monumental depictions of

the electors or their devices – often, though not invariably, accompanied by the Empire’s ruler or armorial – were set up on the façades of town halls and other civic buildings, and on urban fountains, mainly but not only in towns directly under the *Reich*.⁸⁴ The extent to which they came, along with the ruler, to symbolise imperial authority as such is illustrated in the foundation of a chapel in Sluis to commemorate sixty Germans killed in 1436 in fighting in the town. The chapel, in coastal Flanders, remote from the Empire’s German heartlands, was nevertheless to have windows showing not only the imperial armorial but also those of the electors.⁸⁵ The electors visibly partook of a more abstract form of that sacrality which elsewhere in Europe was vested in holy dynasties and wonder-working kings. On the fourteenth-century bronze door-pull from Lübeck’s *Rathaus*, they surround a figure of the emperor in a manner which deliberately recalls Christ with apostles or prophets.⁸⁶

Yet the mere fact of visual representation did not secure hegemonic acceptance for the electors’ view of the Empire’s order, any more than for the pretensions of would-be imperial dynasts like the Luxemburger. By the fifteenth century other, more broadly inclusive figurations of the *Reich* were coming to the fore, reflecting social and political changes afoot in Germany and challenging the electors’ privileged symbolic isolation. The complex heraldic assemblage known as the *Quaternionen*, representing the Empire as the sum of its various estates, received its earliest known depiction in Sigismund’s reign.⁸⁷ The location is significant: the great chamber of the ‘Römer’, Frankfurt-am-Main’s new *Rathaus* – a space within which, in the imperial towns, the doctrines of the *Reich* and perspectives of the burgher communities under its rule characteristically met and merged.

In the imperial towns, the king-emperor was summoned in effigy to the defence of his loyal burghers. In the great chamber of Nuremberg’s newly rebuilt town hall was set up (c. 1340) a monumental stone relief of Ludwig the Bavarian. Seated on an eagle throne and flanked by

angels, the powerfully majestic figure of the emperor appears to have been paired with a representation of Nuremberg's imperial privileges.⁸⁸ A comparable cycle of figures was established around the same time in Cologne – not an imperial city, but one which looked to the Empire to guarantee its extensive autonomies against its lords, the archbishops. There, in the stately *Hansasaal* in the town hall, carvings show a crowned ruler holding a sealed charter, accompanied by figures bearing a water jug and a city gate: personifications of the Rhine staple and right of fortification, grants upon which Cologne's prosperity and independence particularly rested.⁸⁹ If the emperor's proxies in wood and stone were called on to guarantee the status of rich and powerful communities, they might also, however, come to the aid of more remote and imperilled ones. Such was the situation of the imperial town of Mühlhausen in Thuringia, where larger-than-life figures of Charles IV and his consort still incline their heads to the spectator from above the south portal of the *Marienkirche*.⁹⁰ Where the ruler and his court seldom or never came, image-making might ensure an enduring, prophylactic presence. The Empire's symbolic protection had especially striking, if abstract, invocation in those towns in the *königsfern* north which set up or renovated monumental statues of the paladin Roland, strong right arm of that pre-eminent safeguard of imperial rights and justice, Charles the Great.⁹¹

The functioning of such artefacts within the political culture of the towns was often unstable, reflecting the ambivalent and shifting nature of their relations both with the *Reich* and with other masters. Just as some Roland-statues came to be infused with new meaning in the late Middle Ages, as champions of burgher autonomy, so other images too were reinterpreted. The mounted emperor in the market place at Magdeburg, which at first had probably represented the archbishops' lordship over the town, was subsequently made into the townspeople's ally against him.⁹² How far the urban iconography of the *Reich* was intended to exalt its ruler, how far to constrain him, was not in every case clear. The gate through which Charles IV entered Dortmund

in 1377 bore an inscription warning against selling the remote imperial town for gold.⁹³ It was in the nature both of the late medieval *Reich* and of the towns' place within it that its portrayal tended both to trumpet the Empire's special prestige *and* tacitly confess its weakness, to affirm the allegiance of its burghers *and* symbolically declare their independence.

The *Reich* was visibly present among the populations of late medieval Germany in a range of ways and to a surprising degree. This was partly in spite of the limited and faltering scope of its material power, and partly as a consequence of it. The direct role of the Empire's rulers in its propagation was on the whole rather small. What is sometimes seen as an age of burgeoning royal image-making – indeed, 'propaganda' – in western Europe as a whole was scarcely that in Germany.⁹⁴ Kings and emperors made only intermittent, often half-hearted, attempts at crafting their own visual representation and that of the *Reich*.⁹⁵ Charles IV went furthest, but even his achievements were mostly confined to a handful of regions and locations. Many more memorials to the Empire and its rulers were established by other political actors, such as urban elites, the electors and other princes. Entire genres of image came into being largely as a consequence of processes of social, economic, and cultural change, which provided venues, means and motivations for their making. Many sites and artefacts already existed by the thirteenth century; but their persistence, reinterpretation and, in certain instances, renovation reflected the imperialising eye with which some Germans in the late Middle Ages read their native landscapes.

The remarkable extent to which vestiges of the *Reich* were in this period perceived on the ground, renewed, and put in place reflects in part the prestige of an institution which commanded for its partisans unequalled status, antiquity and legitimising potential. But it reflects also the need which Germans in the late Middle Ages felt to conjure up the talismanic benefits of that prestige – which, in its turn, directs attention towards the imperial monarchy's limitations. Image-

making, one might say, was called upon to fill the gap which yawned between authority and material power, aspiration and daily experience. The gothic style became in the late Middle Ages a language of visible proof for an age of anxieties and growing doubts – of which there were many surrounding the *Reich* and its rulers. This was in Germany an age of multiple and conflicting perspectives and messages, of disputed claims, uncertain titles, impostors and, as some maintained, ‘travelling tricksters’ in imperial guise. Such circumstances naturally encouraged a proliferation of images. The gothic style had originated in western Europe as an urban form, and it made its late entry into Germany in the great age of urban growth there, beginning in the thirteenth century. Henceforth, the towns were to be nodal points of representation, and the venues for the contest of images and symbols. They also supplied an audience, and textual sources provide evidence that the signs were indeed noticed and read – although how widely and reflectively is mostly much harder to assess. Nevertheless, it is the number and diversity of those with a stake in the image-making process, along with the comparative absence of direction from above, which commands attention. Illuminating the late medieval *Reich* was to a large extent the work of the populations which stood under its rule.

¹ Alexander von Roes, *Noticia seculi*, cap. 8, in *Alexander von Roes: Schriften*, ed. Herbert Grundmann and Hermann Heimpel (*Monumenta Germaniae Historica* [henceforth *MGH*] *Staatsschriften des späteren Mittelalters*, 1.i, Stuttgart, 1958), p. 154.

² *Sächsische Weltchronik: Sächsische Fortsetzung*, ed. Ludwig Weiland (*MGH Deutsche Chroniken* [henceforth *MGH DC*]2, Hannover, 1877), p. 284.

³ For an overview see Bernard Guenée, *States and Rulers in Later Medieval Europe*, trans. J. Vale (Oxford, 1985).

⁴ Karl-Friedrich Krieger, *König, Reich und Reichsreform im Spätmittelalter* (Munich, 1992). For estimated revenues see p. 34.

⁵ See generally Peter Moraw, 'Die Reichsregierung reist: die deutschen Kaiser von den Ottonen bis zu den Staufern ohne festen Regierungssitz', in Uwe Schultz (ed.), *Die Hauptstädte der Deutschen: Von der Kaiserpfalz in Aachen zum Regierungssitz Berlin* (Munich, 1993), esp. pp. 24, 32.

⁶ For his influential scheme for classifying the regions of late medieval Germany in terms of their relationship with the monarchy see Peter Moraw, *Von offener Verfassung zu gestalteter Verdichtung: Das Reich im späten Mittelalter* (Berlin, 1985), p. 175.

⁷ 'O o der goeckelman ist kumen / hat ein lere taschen prahnt, / das hab wir wol vernumen.' Quoted in Ernst Schubert, 'Probleme der Königsherrschaft im spätmittelalterlichen Reich: Das Beispiel Ruprechts von der Pfalz (1400-10)', in Reinhard Schneider (ed.), *Das spätmittelalterliche Königtum im europäischen Vergleich* (Sigmaringen, 1987), p. 178.

⁸ See generally: Rudolf J. Meyer, *Königs- und Kaiserbegräbnisse im Spätmittelalter: Von Rudolf von Habsburg bis zu Friedrich III.* (Cologne, Weimar and Vienna, 2000); Olaf B. Rader, 'Erinnern für die Ewigkeit: Die Grablegen der Herrscher des Heiligen Römischen Reiches', in Matthias Puhle and Claus-Peter Hasse (eds.), *Heiliges Römisches Reich Deutscher Nation 962 bis 1806: Von Otto dem Großen bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters: Essays* (Dresden: Sandstein, 2006), pp. 173-84.

⁹ For the image of kingship in France see: J.R. Strayer, 'France: the Holy Land, the Chosen People, and the Most Christian King', in Theodore K. Rabb and Jerold E. Seigel (eds.), *Action and Conviction in Early Modern Europe: Essays in Memory of E.H. Harbison* (Princeton NJ,

1969), pp. 3-16; Colette Beaune, *The Birth of an Ideology: Myths and Symbols of Nation in Late-Medieval France*, trans. S.R. Huston (Berkeley CA, 1991).

¹⁰ *Dispatches with Related Documents of Milanese Ambassadors in France and Burgund, 1450-1483*, ed. Paul M. Kendall and Vincent Ilardi, 3 vols (Athens OH, 1970-1981), II.118 (2 March 1461).

¹¹ See František Graus, *Lebendige Vergangenheit: Überlieferung im Mittelalter und in den Vorstellungen vom Mittelalter* (Cologne and Vienna, 1975), esp. p. 222; and more generally H. Wesemann, *Die Cäsarfabeln des Mittelalters* (Löwenberg, 1879).

¹² For the bridge (and a long list of Caesar's alleged town foundations) see *Kaiserchronik eines Regensburger Geistlichen*, ed. Edward Schröder (*MGH DC* 1, Berlin, 1892), p. 87.

¹³ For the anchoring of memory in locality and landscape in the Middle Ages see generally Patrick J. Geary, *Phantoms of Remembrance: Memory and Oblivion at the end of the First Millennium* (Princeton NJ, 1994), esp. p. 124.

¹⁴ *Chronik des Jacob Twinger von Königshofen*, ed. C. Hegel (*Chroniken der deutschen Städte* [henceforth *CdS*] 9, Leipzig, 1870), p. 702.

¹⁵ Gerard Nijsten, *In the Shadow of Burgundy: The Court of Guelders in the Late Middle Ages*, trans. T. Guest (Cambridge, 2004), p. 324.

¹⁶ *Sächsische Weltchronik*, ed. Ludwig Weiland (*MGH DC* 2, Hannover, 1877), p. 86.

¹⁷ Illustrated in P.D.A. Harvey, *Medieval Maps* (London, 1991), p. 30.

¹⁸ Graus, *Lebendige Vergangenheit*, ch. 3.

¹⁹ *Twinger*, ed. Hegel, p. 700.

²⁰ *Liber de rebus memorabilioribus sive Chronicon Henrici de Hervordia*, ed. Augustus Potthast (Göttingen, 1859), p. 213.

-
- ²¹ Ernst Günther Grimme, 'Das gotische Rathaus der Stadt Aachen', in Mario Kramp (ed.), *Krönungen: Könige in Aachen – Geschichte und Mythos*, 2 vols (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1999), II.512.
- ²² Dietrich von Nieheim, *Viridarium Imperatorum et Regum Romanorum*, ed. Alphons Lhotsky and Karl Pivec (*MGH Staatsschriften des späteren Mittelalters* 5, Stuttgart, 1956), pp. 1-2.
- ²³ Bernd Schneidmüller, 'Reichsnähe – Königsferne: Goslar, Braunschweig und das Reich im späten Mittelalter', *Niedersächsisches Jahrbuch für Landesgeschichte*, 64 (1992), p. 12.
- ²⁴ Ulrich Großmann, 'Burgen und Pfalzen des Reiches', in Puhle and Hasse (eds.), *Heiliges Römisches Reich: Essays*, pp. 232-3.
- ²⁵ For examples see Matthias Puhle and Claus-Peter Hasse (eds.), *Heiliges Römisches Reich Deutscher Nation 962 bis 1806: Von Otto dem Großen bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters: Katalog* (Dresden: Sandstein, 2006), V.6, V.10, pp. 375-6, 379-80.
- ²⁶ Grimme, 'Rathaus', in Kramp (ed.), *Krönungen*, II.512.
- ²⁷ Puhle and Hasse (eds.), *Heiliges Römisches Reich: Katalog*, II.10, pp. 56-7.
- ²⁸ Gabriele Köster, 'Zwischen Grabmal und Denkmal: Das Kaiserdenkmal für Speyer und andere Grabmonumente für mittelalterliche Könige und Kaiser im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert', in Puhle and Hasse (eds.), *Heiliges Römisches Reich: Essays*, esp. pp. 400-1.
- ²⁹ Puhle and Hasse (eds.), *Heiliges Römisches Reich: Katalog*, V.3, pp. 371-2.
- ³⁰ Rader, 'Erinnern', p. 177.
- ³¹ See Klaus Militzer, 'Der Erzbischof von Köln und die Krönungen der deutschen Könige (936-1531)', in Kramp (ed.), *Krönungen*, I.107.
- ³² See generally Robert Folz, *Le Souvenir et la Légende de Charlemagne dans l'Empire germanique médiévale* (Paris, 1950); for Charlemagne's representation on Frankfurt's fourteenth-

century Galgentor, Lieselotte E. Saurma-Jeltsch, 'Das mittelalterliche Reich in der Reichsstadt', in Schneidmüller and Weinfurter (eds.), *Heilig – Römisch – Deutsch*, pp. 403-11; for a Charlemagne tapestry, Puhle and Hasse (eds.), *Heiliges Römisches Reich: Katalog*, IV.41, pp. 233-5.

³³ See generally Klaus Niehr, 'Herrscherliche Architektur', in Puhle and Hasse (eds.), *Heiliges Römisches Reich: Essays*, pp. 159-71.

³⁴ See: Wolfgang Schenkluhn, 'Monumentale Repräsentation des Königtums in Frankreich und Deutschland', in Kramp (ed.), *Krönungen*, I.374-6; Klaus Niehr, 'Zeichen des mittelalterlichen Reichs? Speyer – Königsutter – Prag', in Schneidmüller and Weinfurter (eds.), *Heilig – Römisch – Deutsch*, pp. 389-90.

³⁵ Puhle and Hasse (eds.), *Heiliges Römisches Reich: Katalog*, IV.123, pp. 354-5.

³⁶ For gothic imitations of Charlemagne's minster in Nuremberg and Prague, see František Kavka, 'Karl IV. (1349-1378) und Aachen', in Kramp (ed.), *Krönungen*, II.478-9.

³⁷ Franz Machilek, 'Privatfrömmigkeit und Staatsfrömmigkeit', in Ferdinand Seibt (ed.), *Kaiser Karl IV.: Staatsmann und Mäzen* (Munich, 1978), pp. 91-2; Rudolf Chadraha, 'Der "zweite Konstantin": Zum Verhältnis von Staat und Kirche in der karolinischen Kunst Böhmens', *Umeni*, 26 (1978), p. 508. On Prague's role in the projection of Charles' rulership see generally Paul Crossley, 'The politics of presentation: the architecture of Charles IV of Bohemia', in S. Rees Jones *et al.* (eds.), *Courts and Regions in Medieval Europe* (Woodbridge, 2000), pp. 99-172.

³⁸ Lieselotte E. Saurma-Jeltsch, 'Zeichen des Reiches im 14. und frühen 15. Jahrhundert', in Puhle and Hasse (eds.), *Heiliges Römisches Reich: Essays*, p. 346.

³⁹ For the entry of French gothic into Germany see: Willibald Sauerländer, 'Two glances from the north: the presence and absence of Frederick II in the art of the Empire; the court art of Frederick

II and the opus francigenum', in W. Tronzo (ed.), *Intellectual Life at the Court of Frederick II Hohenstaufen* (Washington, 1994), pp. 192-4; Paul Williamson, *Gothic Sculpture 1140-1300* (New Haven and London, 1995), esp. pp. 174-7.

⁴⁰ See generally Schenkluhn, 'Monumentale Repräsentation'; and for the 'Nine Worthies', Von der Dunk, *Das deutsche Denkmal*, pp. 45-8.

⁴¹ Michael Camille, *Gothic Art* (London, 1996), pp. 18, 22-5.

⁴² For late medieval reliquaries see Susanne Wittekind, 'Heiligen- und Reliquienverehrung in staufische Zeit', in Puhle and Hasse (eds.), *Heiliges Römisches Reich: Essays*, esp. pp. 216-18, 221; for the eucharist, Miri Rubin, *Corpus Christi: The Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture* (Cambridge, 1991). The relationship of the visual to problems of doubt and proof is discussed in Caroline Walker Bynum, *Wonderful Blood: Theology and Practice in Late Medieval Northern Germany and Beyond* (Philadelphia, 2007), 'Introduction'.

⁴³ For England, one of the kingdoms which led the document revolution, see M.T. Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record: England 1066-1307* (London, 1979).

⁴⁴ For the Empire there are figures for numbers of documents in Moraw, *Von offener Verfassung*, p. 172 and for their relative distribution in idem, 'Vom Raumgefüge einer spätmittelalterlichen Königsherrschaft: Karl IV. im nordalpinen Reich', in Michael Lindner *et al.* (eds.), *Kaiser, Reich und Region: Studien und Texte aus der Arbeit an den Constitutiones des 14. Jahrhunderts und zur Geschichte der Monumenta Germaniae Historica* (Berlin, 1997), pp. 70, 73. The c.10,000 imperial documents known from the long and busy reign of Charles IV might be contrasted with the 3,646 which the papal chancery was issuing on average *each year* under John XXII (1316-24): R.W. Southern, *Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages* (Harmondsworth, 1970), p. 109.

-
- ⁴⁵ Ernst Schubert, *König und Reich: Studien zur spätmittelalterlichen deutschen Verfassungsgeschichte* (Göttingen, 1979), pp. 358-66; Bettina Pferschy-Maleczek, 'Der Nimbus des Doppeladlers: Mystik und Allegorie im Siegelbild Kaiser Sigmunds', *Zeitschrift für historische Forschung*, 28 (1996), pp. 433-71; Claus D. Bleisteiner, 'Der Doppeladler von Kaiser und Reich im Mittelalter: Imagination und Realität', *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichischen Geschichtsforschung*, 109 (2001), pp. 4-52.
- ⁴⁶ Pferschy-Maleczek, 'Nimbus', p. 447.
- ⁴⁷ Bleisteiner, 'Der Doppeladler', p. 42.
- ⁴⁸ For an example of Charles IV's pairing of the imperial eagle with the Bohemian lion on his seals see the plates in Seibt (ed.), *Kaiser Karl IV*, pp. 327-8; for the double eagle's ascription to earlier emperors, Bleisteiner, 'Der Doppeladler', p. 46.
- ⁴⁹ Twinger, ed. Hegel, Beilagen, no. 11, p. 1042. For a magnificent tent adorned with the emblems of King Wenceslas, the black-on-gold eagle prominent among them, see Barbara Drake Boehm and Jiří Fajt, *Prague: The Crown of Bohemia 1347-1437* (New Haven and London, 2005), p. 234.
- ⁵⁰ Saurma-Jeltsch, 'Zeichen des Reiches', pp. 338, 343.
- ⁵¹ Bernd Kluge, 'Das Münzwesen des Mittelalters im Römisch-deutschen Reich', in Puhle and Hasse (eds.), *Heiliges Römisches Reich: Essays*, pp. 373-82.
- ⁵² Puhle and Hasse (eds.), *Heiliges Römisches Reich: Katalog*, VI.2, pp. 492-5, though the cards shown are of untypically high quality.
- ⁵³ Ulrich Müller (ed.), *Politische Lyrik des deutschen Mittelalters: Texte I* (Göppingen, 1972), p. 89.

⁵⁴ For Rudolf as ‘mager und lank’ see the poet ‘Boppe’ in *ibid.*, p. 90 – one of a number of surviving references to his appearance.

⁵⁵ *Die Chronik des Mathias von Neuenburg*, ed. Adolf Hofmeister (*MGH Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum* [henceforth *SrG*], Nova series, 4, Berlin, 1924), p. 260; and, for the often-violent contest of signs and symbols in late medieval German towns more generally, see Valentin Groebner, *Defaced: The Visual Culture of Violence in the Late Middle Ages*, trans. P. Selwyn (New York, 2004), ch. 2.

⁵⁶ For this period in German urban history see Eberhard Isenmann, *Die deutsche Stadt im Spätmittelalter 1250-1500* (Stuttgart, 1988), esp. ch. 1.

⁵⁷ *Chronica de gestis principum*, in *Bayerische Chroniken des XIV. Jahrhunderts*, ed. Georg Leidinger (*MGH SrG*, 19, Hannover and Leipzig, 1918), pp. 98-8.

⁵⁸ See especially Gerrit Jasper Schenk, *Zeremoniell und Politik: Herrschereinzüge im spätmittelalterlichen Reich* (Cologne, Weimar and Vienna, 2003); also Anna M. Drabek, *Reisen und Reisezeremoniell der römisch-deutschen Herrscher im Spätmittelalter* (Vienna, 1964).

⁵⁹ Drabek, *Reisen*, p. 15.

⁶⁰ On these accounts, see Schenk, *Zeremoniell*, pp. 192-3.

⁶¹ *Chronik von 1368 bis 1406 mit Fortsetzung bis 1447*, ed. F. Frensdorff, in *CdS* 4 (Leipzig, 1865), pp. 59-63. For a full discussion of the evidence for Charles’ funeral, see Meyer, *Königs- und Kaiserbegräbnisse*, esp. pp. 100-18.

⁶² *Liber de rebus memorabilioribus*, ed. Potthast, p. 275.

⁶³ John L. Watts, ‘Looking for the state in later medieval England’, in P. Coss and M. Keen (eds.), *Heraldry, Pageantry and Social Display* (Woodbridge, 2002), pp. 243-67.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 251.

⁶⁵ See *Die goldene Bulle Kaiser Karls IV. vom Jahre 1356*, ed. Wolfgang D. Fritz (*MGH Fontes iuris Germanici antiqui in usum scholarum*, 11, Weimar., 1972), p. 87.

⁶⁶ For full details of locations and attendance, see Gabrielle Annas, *Hoftag – Gemeiner Tag – Reichstag: Studien zur strukturellen Entwicklung deutscher Reichsversammlungen des späten Mittelalters (1349-1471)*, 2 vols (Göttingen, 2004).

⁶⁷ As an example see *Chronik von 1368 bis 1406*, ed. Frensdorff, p. 74, for those attending the assembly held by Wenceslas at Heidelberg in 1384.

⁶⁸ For Prague see Drake Boehm and Fajt (eds.), *Prague*; for Munich, Richard Bauer, ‘München als Landeshauptstadt’, *Zeitschrift für bayerische Landesgeschichte*, 60 (1997), p. 120; for Habsburg Vienna, Thomas H. von der Dunk, *Das Deutsche Denkmal: Eine Geschichte in Bronze und Stein vom Hochmittelalter bis zum Barock* (Cologne, Weimar and Vienna, 1999), pp. 30-3; for Wiener Neustadt, Heinrich Koller, *Kaiser Friedrich III.* (Darmstadt, 2005), pp. 23-4; for Heidelberg, Schubert, ‘Probleme’, esp. pp. 142-3.

⁶⁹ Dankwart Leistikow, ‘Die Aufbewahrungsorte der Reichskleinodien – vom Trifels bis Nürnberg’, in *Die Reichskleinodien: Herrschaftszeichen des Heiligen Römischen Reiches* (Göppingen, 1997), pp. 184-213; for Munich, Alexander Marksches, ‘Ludwig IV., der Bayer (1314-1347): Krone und Krönungen’, in Kramp (ed.), *Krönungen*, II.474; for Prague, Crossley, ‘The politics’, p. 131; for the display of the imperial regalia in Nuremberg see also Puhle and Hasse (eds.), *Heiliges Römisches Reich: Katalog*, V.77-81, pp. 483-90.

⁷⁰ For a convenient narrative history see Heinz Thomas, *Deutsche Geschichte des Spätmittelalters 1250-1500* (Stuttgart, 1983).

⁷¹ Hermann Fillitz, ‘Die Reichskleinodien: Entstehung und Geschichte’, in Puhle and Hasse (eds.), *Heiliges Römisches Reich: Essays*, p. 66.

⁷² Martin Kintzinger, 'Zeichen und Imaginationen des Reichs', in Schneidmüller and Weinfurter (eds), *Heilig – Römisch – Deutsch*, pp. 360-1.

⁷³ Rainer Christoph Schwinges, 'Verfassung und kollektives Verhalten: Zur Mentalität des Erfolges falscher Herrscher im Reich des 13. und 14. Jahrhunderts', in František Graus (ed.), *Mentalitäten im Mittelalter: Methodische und inhaltliche Probleme* (Vorträge und Forschungen, 35, Sigmaringen, 1987), pp. 177-202.

⁷⁴ Schwinges, 'Verfassung', pp. 180-1; Tilman Struve, 'Die falschen Friedriche und die Friedenssehnsucht des Volkes im späten Mittelalter', in *Fälschungen im Mittelalter: Internationaler Kongress der Monumenta Germaniae Historica, München, 16.-19. September 1986* (MGH Schriften 33.i, Hannover, 1988), pp. 319-20.

⁷⁵ In this Germany also shared in a broader European trend of the period. See, e.g., Claire Richter Sherman, *The Portraits of Charles V of France (1338-1380)* (New York, 1969).

⁷⁶ Iva Rosario, *Art and Propaganda: Charles IV of Bohemia, 1346-1378* (Woodbridge, 2000), p. 13; and see also Johanna von Herzogenberg, 'Die Bildnisse Kaiser Karls IV.', in Seibt (ed.), *Kaiser Karl IV.*, pp. 324-34.

⁷⁷ Thus the carved busts of Charles and his queen, Elizabeth of Pomerania, set up on the rebuilt church of St Nicholas at Luckau in Lusatia, to which the emperor had donated a valuable relic: Michael Lindner, 'Kaiser Karl IV. und Mitteldeutschland', in Lindner *et al.* (eds.), *Kaiser, Reich und Region*, pp. 134-5.

⁷⁸ Saurma-Jeltsch, 'Zeichen des Reiches', pp. 346-7.

⁷⁹ *Ottokars österreichische Reimchronik*, ed. Joseph Seemüller (MGH DC, 5.i, Hannover, 1890), pp. 508-9, vv. 39125-194. For tomb and anecdote see Robert Suckale, 'Die Hofkunst im 14. Jahrhundert', in Puhle and Hasse (eds.), *Heiliges Römisches Reich: Essays*, pp. 323-4.

⁸⁰ Ernst-Dieter Hehl, 'Die Erzbischöfe von Mainz bei Erhebung, Salbung und Krönung des Königs (10. bis 14. Jahrhundert)', in Kramp (ed.), *Krönungen*, I.101-2.

⁸¹ Otto Volk, 'Von Grenzen ungestört – auf dem Weg nach Aachen: Die Krönungsfahrten der deutschen Könige im späten Mittelalter', in Wolfgang Haubrichs et al. (eds.), *Grenzen erkennen – Begrenzungen überwinden: Festschrift für Reinhard Schneider zur Vollendung seines 65. Lebensjahres* (Sigmaringen, 1999), pp. 268, 270, 291-2.

⁸² See generally: Ernst Schubert, 'Königswahl und Königtum im spätmittelalterlichen Reich', *Zeitschrift für historische Forschung*, 4 (1977), pp. 257-338; Armin Wolf, *Die Entstehung des Kurfürstenkollegs 1198-1298: Zur 700-jährigen Wiederkehr der ersten Vereinigung der sieben Kurfürsten* (Idstein, 1998).

⁸³ Thus in the civic meeting hall on the Fish Market in Aachen, which in the second half of the thirteenth century appears to have acquired its frieze showing a ruler with six electors: Saurma-Jeltsch, 'Reichsstadt', pp. 411-13; Grimme, 'Rathaus', in Kramp (ed.), *Krönungen*, II.512.

⁸⁴ See: Henry J. Cohn, 'The electors and imperial rule at the end of the fifteenth century', in Björn Weiler and Simon MacLean (eds.), *Representations of Power in Medieval Germany 800-1500* (Turnhout, 2006), esp. pp. 296-7; 'Von den Königswählern zum Kurfürstenkolleg: Bilddenkmale als unerkannte Dokumente der Verfassungsgeschichte', in Reinhard Schneider and Harald Zimmermann (eds.), *Wahlen und Wählen im Mittelalter* (Vorträge und Forschungen, 37, Sigmaringen, 1990), pp. 15-78. For the celebrated Nuremberg *Schöne Brunnen* see Von der Dunk, *Das deutsche Denkmal*, pp. 45-6 and (for the representative role of fountains more generally), 50-1; for an example from a princely town in the *königsfern* north – Braunschweig – see Schneidmüller, 'Reichsnähe – Königsferne', pp. 48-9.

-
- ⁸⁵ See Werner Paravicini, 'Schuld und Sühne: der Hansenmord zu Sluis in Flandern, anno 1436', in Hans-Peter Baum *et al.* (eds.), *Wirtschaft, Gesellschaft, Mentalitäten im Mittelalter: Festschrift zum 75. Geburtstag von Rolf Sprandel* (Stuttgart, 2006), esp. p. 425. I am indebted to Erik Spindler for this reference.
- ⁸⁶ Saurma-Jeltsch, 'Reichsstadt', pp. 412-18; Puhle and Hasse (eds.), *Heiliges Römisches Reich: Katalog*, V.37, pp. 422-4.
- ⁸⁷ Cohn, 'The electors', pp. 295-6; Puhle and Hasse (eds.), *Heiliges Römisches Reich: Katalog*, VI.55, pp. 572-4.
- ⁸⁸ Robert Suckale, *Die Hofkunst Kaiser Ludwigs des Bayern* (Munich, 1993), pp. 257-9; Saurma-Jeltsch, 'Zeichen des Reiches', pp. 340-2.
- ⁸⁹ Saurma-Jeltsch, 'Reichsstadt', pp. 419-22.
- ⁹⁰ Von der Dunk, *Das deutsche Denkmal*, p. 52.
- ⁹¹ W. Trusen, 'Rolandsäulen', in A. Erler and E. Kaufmann (eds.), *Handwörterbuch zur deutschen Rechtsgeschichte*, vol. 4 (Berlin, 1990), cols. 1102-6; Von der Dunk, *Das deutsche Denkmal*, pp. 54-6.
- ⁹² Puhle and Hasse (eds.), *Heiliges Römisches Reich: Katalog*, IV.95, pp. 314-16. For the reinterpretation of Roland-statues see Von der Dunk, *Das deutsche Denkmal*, p. 56.
- ⁹³ Schenk, *Zeremoniell*, p. 316 n. 354. Whether the inscription was set up specifically for Charles' visit is not known. On the mixed messages in royal receptions into towns see also Michail A. Bojcow, 'Ephemerität und Permanenz bei Herrschereinzügen im spätmittelalterlichen Deutschland', *Marburger Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft* 24 (1997), esp. p. 90.
- ⁹⁴ For 'propaganda' in England and France in this period see Christopher Allmand, *The Hundred Years War: England and France at War c.1300-c.1450* (Cambridge, 1988), ch. 6.

⁹⁵ For the modest image projected by the early post-Staufer kings see Suckale, 'Die Hofkunst', esp. pp. 323-5; for Frederick III's largely ineffectual attempts in this regard, Koller, *Kaiser Friedrich III.*, esp. p. 250.